INFO-HAMS Digest Thu, 14 Dec 89 Volume 89 : Issue 1016

Today's Topics:

Date: 14 Dec 89 07:51:47 GMT
From: tank!cps3xx!usenet@handies.ucar.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: Antennas
Message-ID: <5796@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <12549900427007@osu-20.ircc.ohio-state.edu> BERTSCH-S@osu-20.ircc.ohio-state.edu (Steve Bertsch) writes:
>In a few magazine articles I've seen the terms 'near field' and 'far field',
>but I can't find any mention of these terms in any of the radio or
>electronics texts I've tried. Can anyone define these terms?

near field: the field generated by the antenna, within 1 wavelength
of the antenna

far field: the field generated by the antenna, farther than 1
wavelength from the antenna.

In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
Internet: kjh@usc.edu UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh

Date: 14 Dec 89 08:01:35 GMT
From: tank!cps3xx!usenet@handies.ucar.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <5797@cps3xx.UUCP>

I have been carrying on an e-mail conversation with stevew@wyse.com
concerning interaction with league officials. I feel that this letter
I wrote to stevew is relevant, and would be appropriately posted here.

The ARRL tries to present itself as a general purpose organization which

represents the broad interests of ALL amateurs. As such, they (in the past) have tried to include a little of everything in QST. This is as it should be for a general purpose organization. They are now changing their tune where microwave coverage in QST is concerned. It is not acceptable to ENTIRELY DROP microwave coverage from QST as they have done. It is also not acceptable to shuttle microwave coverage off to special purpose and special interest publications of the league. What the general amateur population needs from the league is coverage of all facets of the hobby. People who are not microwave enthusiests (for example) should have exposure to microwave activity and techniques through the ARRL's publications. If this exposure does not exist, then usage of microwaves (for example) will not grow. This is detrimental to all of amateur radio! Moving microwave coverage to special interest publications is akin to preaching to the converted. We need preaching to the unconverted masses.

There is a lot of hypocrisy in claiming to represent all amateurs and then dropping coverage of one facet of the hobby enjoyed by a minority. A little coverage (which is what we had) is far better than no coverage at all, and is probably better than too much coverage. If there is too much coverage, then people won't read it at all. If there is no coverage; people can't read what isn't there. I wasn't asking for the ARRL to increase their microwave coverage, just to include some in QST - aimed at all amateurs. Paul Rinaldo, who is the editor of QST, made the decision to CUT ALL microwave coverage for the time being. He has his reasons, and they appear to all be economic.

I cannot accept his decision to TOTALLY CUT ALL microwave coverage. It might have been acceptable to cut back some, but he has gone entirely too far. As I understand it, the buck stops at Rinaldo as far as coverage in QST is concerned. Because of Rinaldo's actions, my buck (and my support, and my respect) has stopped flowing to Newington.

In the rare case that original ideas are found here, I am responsible.
Internet: kjh@usc.edu
Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh

Date: 14 Dec 89 10:40:32 GMT
From: usc!brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@apple.com
Subject: BUSINESS allocations
Message-ID: <30500322@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> My wife's library is trying to use radio modems to link terminals in their book
> mobiles to the mini in the main library which handles circulation records.
>
> The company who handled their data communications says the frequencies they're

> using (sought and selected by the company on the library's behalf) are o.k. for
> both voice and data communications. They've received a complaint of inter-
> ference from a couple of other folks (they were TOLD they had the channel to
> themselves in this area!) that, not only are they interfering, but that it's
> because they're running data on these channels when they're only authorized
> for voice.
>
> Does this make any sense--do the business band allocations have voice-only and
> data-allowable sub-allocations? BTW, her freqs are 461.4/466.4MHz.

Those frequencies are not allocated for "telemetry" use by the FCC. However
it is not clear to me yet that this means data. There are lots of frequencies
that are, and most are rather wideband and above 800 Mhz.

Still, I'm curious why data is interference when voice is not. That would
depend on the spectra of the signal during transmission of data, the baud
rate, etc. See if you can actually hear the interference mentioned, and find
out what frequency is being interefered.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 14 Dec 89 06:14:00 GMT
From: brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@apple.com
Subject: Encryption, control, other random t
Message-ID: <30500325@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> Gentlemen and Ladies:
>
>   Encryption of cellular phones does not have to be complex. Neither does
> it have to be unbreakable. Even a simple, easily breakable scheme would solve
> the problems of the ECPA. My reasoning is this. The indended purpose of the
> ECPA was to protect the privacy of cell-phone users. The ECPA chose to do that
> by saying "you can't listen to them." If a encryption/digital coding system
> were to be used, however simple, to make the voice unintelligible to the
> "casual" listener, then the purpose of the EPCA will have been achieved. The
> person who takes the "extra step" to decode these transmissions is easily seen
> as having "criminal intent". And of course, none of US will do that. Make the
             ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^   ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
seen by WHO ????

speak for yourself.   Having written more than one decryption program (as well
as encryption), such things now are as easy as plugging in a demodulator. Its
not the "extra step" you claim it to be. When other public services go with
simple encryption, most scanner/monitor types will be decrypting. Only if they
make it really TOUGH will they knock people out of the hobby.

> penalties for decoding the transmissions the same as for an illegal wiretap.
> It in effect does the same thing. This idea, of course, is Santayannaish and
> unenforceable, but it does solve the problem without the dangerous precedent of
> the FCC being able to decide what we can and cannot listen to.

The better route is just to use a good enough algorithm that, w/o the key, I
cannot decrypt, and just keep the keys secure. Then and ONLY THEN will you
have a "reasonable expectation of privacy".

>   Related to that...can anybody tell me of a valid reason to listen to
> the cell-phone stuff anyway outside of sheer Mrs Grundyism (Mrs Grundyism = the
> uncontrollable urge to mind other people's buisness....)? Does it have any
> public service function? 90% of the stuff is utterly boring anyway, or so I
> would assume from my own use of the telephone....

Can anyone tell me a valid reason for listening to LOUD HEAVY METAL MUSIC?
Why not outlaw that, since it serves "no useful purpose".

Come on, get REAL... the issue is not WHY people do what they do. Validity
should not be based on WHY... ever.

>   All I want for Christmas is my ticket! (being processed as we speak)
> Who does the FCC hire in Gettysburg, anyway! (sorry. a little flame here...)

Not very many people.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 14 Dec 89 06:02:00 GMT
From: brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@apple.com
Subject: FT-470, the continuing saga...
Message-ID: <30500324@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> I spoke to an engineer at Yaesu (in Cerritos, CA.) about the only problem
> I have with the HT - intermod in RF hot areas here in Orange county, CA. -
> and he explained to me that the receiver is so hot (this appears to be true
> when comparing to other HT's I own) that some intermod is unavoidable if you
> use a gain antenna and are in a hot area.
>
> Of course, I would like to have an attenuator for the receiver built in to the
> rig to take care of such problems, anyone out there ever attempt such a thing?
> Looks like Kenwood put one into their dual band HT, (but the specs for recieve
> sensitivity are not the same), does this help you Kenwood users?

Didn't receivers used to have a front-end tuned circuit that somewhat closely tracked the frequency you were tuned to so that intermod (and probably more importantly at the time) image rejection could be done? I know I saw an AM radio construction circuit one time where there was a front end. You had to have it if converting to 455 khz I.F. on such a wide band. Why can't today's receivers use the same "technology"?

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 14 Dec 89 10:40:25 GMT
From: usc!brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@apple.com
Subject: Modifying Radios for out of band us
Message-ID: <30500321@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

And of course UHF radios can be modified to cover 420-440 Mhz. Unfortunately that also opens up the public service bands, so the dealers have decided that you need to have a MARS license for the mods info (what a bunch of B.S. !!).

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: 14 Dec 89 06:15:00 GMT
From: brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@apple.com
Subject: Proposed new group "rec.speeding"
Message-ID: <30500326@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

rec.auto.driving.speeding.radardetecting.gettingcaught.goingtojail

----

Date: 14 Dec 89 05:58:00 GMT
From: brutus.cs.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!phil@apple.com
Subject: RST
Message-ID: <30500323@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

> Heard during the Ten Meter Contest last weekend:
>
> N3xxx: "KH6xxx 59 Pennsylvania."
> KH6xxx: "You're 59 Hawaii. QSL?"
> N3xxx: "QSL. Thanks for Hawaii! How's my signal out there?"
>
>   :-)

Of course that's a special case of RS(T) report, the "contest RST".
The N3 obviously knew it was. The KH6 did, too.

Maybe we can get the contest rules to make US hams give contact number.

--Phil Howard, KA9WGN--
<phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 89 07:17:40 EST
From: Robert Carpenter <rc@cmr.ncsl.nist.gov>
Subject: Where is Sandown Park (GB) ?
Message-ID: <8912141217.AA01799@cmr.ncsl.nist.gov>

December RadCom mentions a revised date for the annual Sandown Park VHF Convention. Since there is some chance that I might be able to be there, I would appreciate info on the location. I have looked in the old Shell Guide to Britain and the recent Ord Survey 3" to 1 mi map book index and can't find any "Sandown"s except the town on the Isle of Wight. Is that the place?

Any help will be appreciated.

Bob W3OTC

PS Yes, yes, I DO have many years of old RadComs **somewhere**; see pages 14 and 15 of the Dec 89 issue to get an idea of why I can't find them!!

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1016
****